

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application with claims 4, 17, 27, 30 and 33 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Fimoff, which is respectfully traversed.

The present invention currently includes independent claims 1, 4, 14, 17, 24, 27, 30 and 33. In more detail, the present invention is directed to an apparatus and method that conserves memory which adaptively down-converting various formatted signals applied to digital television. On the contrary, the decoder of Fimoff is specifically directed to a device provided in an NTSC receiver to display an input digital signal at a lower resolution. This differs from the present invention as recited in claim 1 which is directed to an apparatus for receiving motion pictures which converts an extracted bit stream to a field DCT coded block if the extracted video bit stream corresponds to a frame DCT coded block and performs a down-conversion as a field DCT coded blocked if the extracted video bit stream has a field DCT coded block.

Serial No. 09/769,421
Amendment dated March 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2004

Docket No. CIT/K-0136

Further, independent claim 14 specifically recites that the video processor performs down-conversion of a frame DCT coded block and a field DCT coded block to a picture of a pixel based on only a top field. Regarding the subject matter recited in claim 14, the Office Action indicates a top field is the same as only one field (see page 4 in the Office Action). However, Fimoff does not teach or suggest only a top field as claimed nor the advantages thereof. Similar comments apply to independent claims 17, 30 and 33.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 4, 14, 17, 24, 27, 30 and 33 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, claims 4, 17, 27, 30 and 33 have been amended to correct minor cosmetic informalities. It is respectfully submitted these amendments do not raise a new issue and thus this amendment should be entered.

Serial No. 09/769,421
Amendment dated March 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2004

Docket No. CIT/K-0136

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287
David A. Bilodeau
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 CLD/DAB:lew
Date: March 22, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2016\2016-417\29198.2.doc